

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection contained in the Office Action are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 2 and 8 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-10 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-10 are pending herein.

Summary of the Rejections:

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Pinder et al. (U.S. 6,105,134, hereafter "Pinder").

Applicants' Traversal:

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to base claims 1, 6-7 overcome all of the rejections listed above.

For example, base claim 1 has been amended to recite a broadcast network comprising an information server coupled to an internet protocol gateway; a plurality of subscriber terminals coupled to the internet protocol gateway, the subscriber terminals for transmitting broadcast signals to the subscriber terminals; a return channel for transmitting information from a subscriber terminal to a head-end; authentication means coupled to an internet protocol

gateway, the authentication means for authorizing the access of the subscriber terminal to interactive services, wherein the subscriber terminal includes an authorization transmitting means for transmitting authorization request messages using the internet protocol gateway to an authorization server, the authorization server being arranged for checking the entitlement of the subscriber to services to be provided by the information server, and in that the authorization server is arranged for enabling the subscriber to access said services

Applicants respectfully submit that Pinder, does not disclose, suggest, or provide a network wherein an information server, subscriber terminals and an authorization server all use an internet protocol gateway to authorize the access of the subscriber terminals to interactive services, as recited above.

Although, Pinder, teaches the use in an IP packet, it uses the IP packets for the digital broadband delivery system 501, i.e. transmission of content to the subscriber terminals, col. 18, lines 42-56. Thus, Pinder does not show that the subscriber terminal includes an authorization transmitting means for transmitting authorization request messages using the internet protocol gateway to an authorization server.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that at least for the reasons indicated above, instant base claims 1, 6-7 are patentable. With regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), the Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit has held that:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

In the present application, it is respectfully submitted that Pinder fails to disclose each and every element as set forth in base claim 1 and 6-7. Nor would a person of ordinary skill in the art have found any of the instant claims obvious in view of Pinder.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Daniel Piotrowski, Reg. 42,079  
Attorney  
(914) 333-9624

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS  
Alexandria, VA 22313

On November 10, 2003

By Edna Chase